UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,748	06/21/2001	Shoichi Matsuo	JP920000121US1	5920

7590 07/12/2005

Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER	
GUILL, RUSSELL L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2123	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,748	MATSUO, SHOICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Russell L. Guill	2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 – 6, 8 – 10, 12, 14, 16 – 17, 19, and 22 - 23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 – 6, 8 – 10, 12, 14, 16 – 17, 19, and 22 - 23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/27/2005
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 5, 12, and 22 are the original claims. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, and 23 were amended. Claims 7, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, and 21 were cancelled. Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 10, 12, 14, 16 - 17, 19, and 22 - 23 have been examined. Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 10, 12, 14, 16 - 17, 19, and 22 - 23 have been rejected.

Response to Remarks

2. Regarding item numbers 4.0 and 18.0: The Examiner agrees that "shadow property" is given reasonable clarity and precision in the specification, and withdraws the associated rejection.

3. Regarding item number 5.0: The Examiner agrees that "influence area" is given reasonable clarity and precision in the specification, and withdraws the associated rejection.

4. Regarding item numbers 6.0 - 17.0: These claims have been corrected, amended, or canceled to remove the rejections.

5. Regarding item 19.0: There was no issue cited.

6. Regarding item 20.0: The Examiner finds the Applicant's arguments persuasive, and the claims are being examined with new art.

7. Regarding item 21.0: The Examiner finds the Applicant's arguments persuasive, and the claims are being examined with new art.

8. Regarding item 22.0: The Examiner finds the Applicant's arguments persuasive, and the claims are being examined with new art.

9. Regarding item 23.0: The claims have been canceled, and therefore the rejections are moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10.1. Claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10.1.1. The claims recite, "expanding a macro function included in said configuration file template recursively". The recursive expansion of a macro function is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10.1.2. The claims recite, "replacing a property specified in said macro function with a property specific to said system". The "replacing a property specified in said macro function with a property specific to said system" is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10.1.3. The claims recite, "replacing said shadow property or the property specified in said macro function with a plurality of properties". The "replacing said shadow property or the property specified in said macro function with a plurality of properties" is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10.1.4. The claims recite, "expanding recursively according to a macro control statement". The "expanding recursively according to a macro control statement" is not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11.1. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim recites, "replacing a shadow property included in said configuration file template". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase, "said configuration file template" is interpreted as "a configuration file template". Correction or amendment is required.

11.2. Claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11.2.1. The claims recite, "expanding a macro function included in said configuration file template recursively". The Examiner cannot determine the scope of the claim from the specification. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase is interpreted as "expanding a macro included in said configuration file template".

11.2.2. The claims recite, "replacing a property specified in said macro function with a property specific to said system". The Examiner cannot determine the scope of the claim from the specification. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase is interpreted as "replacing a property specified in a macro with a property specific to said system".

11.2.3. The claims recite, "replacing said shadow property or the property specified in said macro function with a plurality of properties". The Examiner cannot determine the scope of the claim from the specification. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase is interpreted as "replacing a property specified in a macro with a plurality of property values specific to said system".

11.2.4. The claims recite, "expanding recursively according to a macro control statement". The Examiner cannot determine the scope of the claim from the specification. For the purpose of claim examination, the phrase is interpreted as "expanding according to a macro statement".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204) in view of Eidahl (Eidahl, Loren D.; "Platinum Edition Using Visual Basic 6", 1999, Que Corporation), further in view of Goodman (Goodman, Danny; "Dynamic HTML: The Definitive Reference", 1998, O'Reilly & Associates).

13.1. Hansen teaches in response to a specification of a component provided by a system configuration editor, generating said component in a drawing screen of said system configuration editor (*figure 4; and column 11, lines 63 - 67; and column 12, lines 1 - 7*).

13.2. Hansen teaches associating a plurality of components by responding to an operation that generates a connecting line that associates a component with any other component (*figure 4; and column 12, lines 26 - 45*).

13.3. Hansen teaches recording attribute data that is input as a property of said component (*figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

13.4. Hansen teaches automatically generating a configuration file of a system from attribute data and a configuration file template (*figure 1B, elements 12, 14, 18, 20, and 22; and column 5, lines 9 – 67; and column 6, lines 1 – 25*).

13.5. Hansen teaches that in the step of automatically generating the configuration file, replacing a shadow property included in the configuration file template with a property specific to the system included in the attribute data (*column 3, lines 37 – 58, especially lines 50 – 58; and column 14, lines 34 – 50*).

13.6. Hansen teaches expanding a macro function included in a configuration file template, and replacing a property specified in the macro function with a property specific to the system (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 – 44; and column 3, lines 37 – 58, especially lines 50 – 58; and column 14, lines 34 – 50*).

13.7. Hansen teaches expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a property specific to the system (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 – 44; and column 3, lines 37 – 58, especially lines 50 – 58; and column 14, lines 34 – 50*).

13.8. Hansen does not specifically teach associating a plurality of components by one of the steps of*: including a component in any other component, superposing said component on any other component*, and responding to an operation that generates a connecting line that associates a component and any other component.

13.9. Hansen does not specifically teach expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a *plurality of properties* specific to the system.

13.10. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by including a component in any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by including the components in a frame component*).

13.11. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by superposing a component on any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by superposing the components on a frame component*).

13.12. Goodman teaches replacing a shadow property or a property specified in a macro function with a *plurality of properties* (*page 912*).

13.13. The motivation to combine the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Eidahl that a container control component can hold other control components within its borders, and the contained components are treated as part of the container component (*page 168, first paragraph*).

13.14. The motivation to combine the art of Goodman with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Goodman that a scripting language makes it possible to dynamically access and control items in an object model (*page 909, first paragraph; and pages 11 - 12, section labeled "ECMA Script"*).

13.15. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Eidahl and Goodman with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

14. **Claims 2 and 3** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Eidahl and Goodman, in view of Contreras (U.S. Patent Number 6,823,299).

14.1. **Regarding claim 2:**

14.2. Hansen teaches inputting default data to a part of attribute data of a component (*column 7, lines 24 - 27*).

14.3. Hansen does not specifically teach inputting default data to a part of attribute data a component, *wherein said default data includes an influence area of said component and a reference point of said component*.

14.4. Contreras teaches default data includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*).

14.4.1. Regarding (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*); it would have been obvious to have default data that includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component.

14.5. The motivation to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Contreras that the invention could be used to automatically position objects to help create designs (*column 7, lines 26 - 28*).

14.6. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

14.7. **Regarding claim 3**:

14.8. Hansen does not specifically teach if all or part of component is included within an influence area of any other component, then a part of attribute data of said component inherits the attribute data of said other component.

14.9. Eidahl teaches if all or part of component is included within an influence area of any other component, then a part of attribute data of said component inherits the attribute data of said other component (*page 64, the paragraph that starts with, "In addition, setting the form's . . ."*).

15. **Claim 4** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Eidahl and Goodman, in view of Chiles (U.S. Patent 6,167,567).

15.1. Hansen does not specifically teach referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

15.2. Chiles teaches referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

15.3. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (*column 3, lines 20 - 21*).

15.4. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

16. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204) in view of Goodman (Goodman, Danny; "Dynamic HTML: The Definitive Reference", 1998, O'Reilly & Associates).

16.1. Hansen teaches means for providing components of a system (*figure 4; and column 11, lines 63 - 67; and column 12, lines 1 - 7*).

16.2. Hansen teaches means for displaying said components and relations between said components and editing an arrangement of said components (*figure 4; and column 10, lines 14 - 22*).

16.3. Hansen teaches means for generating or inputting and displaying properties of said components (*figure 5; and figure 6; and column 7, lines 24 - 28; and column 2, lines 28 - 65*).

16.4. Hansen teaches means for receiving said properties that are generated or input as attribute data of said components and automatically generating a configuration file of the system (*column 3, lines 50 - 58*).

16.5. Hansen teaches that in the means for automatically generating the configuration file, replacing a shadow property included in the configuration file template with a property specific to the system included in the attribute data (*column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.6. Hansen teaches means for expanding a macro function included in a configuration file template, and replacing a property specified in the macro function with a property specific to the system (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 - 44; and column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.7. Hansen teaches means for expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a property specific to the system (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 - 44; and column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

16.8. Hansen does not specifically teach means for expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a ***plurality of properties*** specific to the system.

16.9. Goodman teaches replacing a shadow property or a property specified in a macro function with a ***plurality of properties*** (***page 912***).

16.10. The motivation to combine the art of Goodman with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Goodman that a scripting language makes it possible to dynamically access and control items in an object model (***page 909, first paragraph; and pages 11 - 12, section labeled "ECMA Script"***).

16.11. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Goodman with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

17. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Goodman, in view of Eidahl, further in view of Contreras.

17.1. Hansen teaches means for generating default data as a part of attribute data of a component (***column 7, lines 24 - 27***).

17.2. Hansen teaches means for associating a plurality of components by generating a connecting line that associates a component with any other component (***figure 4; and column 12, lines 26 - 45***).

17.3. Hansen does not specifically teach means for generating default data as a part of attribute data a component, ***wherein said default data includes an influence area of said component and a reference point of said component***.

17.4. Hansen does not specifically teach means for associating a plurality of components ***by one of the steps of: including said component in any other component, superposing said component on any other component***, and by generating a connecting line that associates said component with any other component, ***wherein if said component***

is included within an influence area of any other component, then attribute data of said component inherits attribute data of said other component.

17.5. Eidahl teaches means for associating a plurality of components by including a component in any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by including the components in a frame component*).

17.6. Eidahl teaches means for associating a plurality of components by superposing a component on any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by superposing the components on a frame component*).

17.7. Eidahl teaches if a component is included within an influence area of any other component, then attribute data of the component inherits attribute data of the other component (*page 64, the paragraph that starts with, "In addition, setting the form's . . . "*).

17.8. Contreras teaches that default data includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*).

17.8.1. Regarding (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*); it would have been obvious to have default data that includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component.

17.9. The motivation to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Contreras that the invention could be used to automatically position objects to help create designs (*column 7, lines 26 - 28*).

17.10. The motivation to combine the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Eidahl that a container control component can hold other control components within its borders, and the contained components are treated as part of the container component (*page 168, first paragraph*). Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Eidahl and Contreras with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

18. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Goodman, in view of Chiles.

18.1. Hansen does not specifically teach means for referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

18.2. Chiles teaches referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (***column 2, lines 41 – 56***).

18.3. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (***column 3, lines 20 – 21***).

18.4. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

19. Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Eidahl.

19.1. Regarding claim 9:

19.2. Hansen teaches most of the limitations of claim 9 as described in claim 1 above.

19.3. Hansen does not specifically teach that if a component is included within an influence area of any other component, then inheriting attribute data of said other component by attribute data of said component.

19.4. Hansen does not specifically teach associating a plurality of components by including a component in any other component.

19.5. Hansen does not specifically teach associating a plurality of components by superposing a component on any other component.

19.6. Eidahl teaches if a component is included within an influence area of any other component, then inheriting attribute data of said other component by attribute data of said component (***page 64, the paragraph that starts with, "In addition, setting the form's . . . "***).

19.7. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by including a component in any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by including the components in a frame component*).

19.8. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by superposing a component on any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by superposing the components on a frame component*).

19.9. The motivation to combine the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Eidahl that a container control component can hold other control components within its borders, and the contained components are treated as part of the container component (*page 168, first paragraph*).

19.10. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

19.11. **Regarding claim 12**:

19.12. Hansen does not specifically teach inputting a property, wherein properties that can be input are restricted to a part of properties that can be associated with the component.

19.13. Eidahl teaches inputting a property, wherein properties that can be input are restricted to a part of properties that can be associated with the component (*page 21, paragraph 4 that starts with the phrase, "Properties determine how . . ."*).

20. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen and Eidahl, in view of Contreras.

20.1. Hansen teaches inputting default data to a part of attribute data of a component (*column 7, lines 24 - 27*).

20.2. Hansen does not specifically teach inputting default data to a part of attribute data a component, *wherein said default data includes an influence area of said component and a reference point of said component*.

20.3. Contreras teaches default data includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*).

20.3.1. Regarding (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*); it would have been obvious to have default data that includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component.

20.4. The motivation to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Contreras that the invention could be used to automatically position objects to help create designs (*column 7, lines 26 - 28*). Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

21. **Claims 14 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204) in view of Eidahl (Eidahl, Loren D.; "Platinum Edition Using Visual Basic 6", 1999, Que Corporation), further in view of Contreras (U.S. Patent Number 6,823,299).

21.1. **Regarding claim 14:**

21.2. Hansen teaches a means for providing components of a system (*figure 4; and column 11, lines 63 - 67; and column 12, lines 1 - 7*).

21.3. Hansen teaches a means for displaying the components and relations between the components and editing an arrangement of the components (*figure 4; and column 10, lines 14 - 22*).

21.4. Hansen teaches a means for inputting and displaying properties of the components (*figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

21.5. Hansen teaches a means for, in response to the generation of a component, generating default data as a part of attribute data of said component (*column 7, lines 24 - 27*).

21.6. Hansen teaches means for associating a plurality of said components by generating a connecting line that associates said component with any other component (*figure 4; and column 12, lines 26 - 45*).

21.7. Hansen does not specifically teach a means for, in response to the generation of a component, generating default data as a part of attribute data of said component, *wherein the default data includes an influence area of said component and a reference point of said component*.

21.8. Hansen does not specifically teach means for associating a plurality of said components *by generating, moving or changing said component, such that said component is included in any other component or said component is superposed on any other component*, or by generating a connecting line that associates said component with any other component, *wherein if part of said component is included within an influence area of any other component, then attribute data of said component inherits attribute data of said other component*.

21.9. Eidahl teaches if part of a component is included within an influence area of any other component, then attribute data of the component inherits attribute data of the other component (*page 64, the paragraph that starts with, "In addition, setting the form's . . . "*).

21.10. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by generating, moving or changing said component, such that said component is included in any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by including the components in a frame component*).

21.11. Eidahl teaches associating a plurality of components by generating, moving or changing said component, such that said component is superposed on any other component (*page 383, section "Working with Controls in a Frame"; a control component was associated with other components by superposing the components on a frame component*).

21.12. Contreras teaches that default data includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*).

21.12.1. Regarding (*column 7, lines 1 - 5; and column 8, lines 41 - 45*); it would have been obvious to have default data that includes an influence area of a component and a reference point of a component.

21.13. The motivation to use the art of Contreras with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Contreras that the invention could be used to automatically position objects to help create designs (***column 7, lines 26 - 28***).

21.14. The motivation to combine the art of Eidahl with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Eidahl that a container control component can hold other control components within its borders, and the contained components are treated as part of the container component (***page 168, first paragraph***).

21.15. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Eidahl and Contreras with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed invention.

21.16. Regarding claim 16:

21.17. Hansen does not specifically teach that means for inputting and displaying properties further comprises means for restricting properties that can be input to a part of properties that can be associated with a component.

21.18. Eidahl teaches that means for inputting and displaying properties further comprises means for restricting properties that can be input to a part of properties that can be associated with a component (***page 21, paragraph 4 that starts with the phrase, "Properties determine how . . ."***).

22. **Claims 17, 19 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent 6,772,204), in view of Chiles (U.S. Patent 6,167,567), further in view of Goodman (Goodman, Danny; "Dynamic HTML: The Definitive Reference", 1998, O'Reilly & Associates).

22.1. Regarding claims 17, 19 and 22:

22.2. Hansen teaches computer implemented methods (**Abstract**), functions (**Abstract; and column 18, 38 - 40**) and means (**Abstract**).

22.2.1. Regarding (**Abstract**) and (**Abstract; and column 18, 38 - 40**); it would have been obvious that computer implemented methods and program code are functions and means.

22.3. Hansen teaches receiving attribute data of components that comprise the system (*figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

22.4. Hansen teaches expanding the configuration file template with macro expansion (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 - 44; and column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

22.5. Hansen teaches that in the step of automatically generating the configuration file, replacing a shadow property included in the configuration file template with a property specific to the system included in the attribute data (*column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

22.6. Hansen teaches expanding a macro function included in a configuration file template, and replacing a property specified in the macro function with a property specific to the system (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 - 44; and column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

22.7. Hansen teaches expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a property specific to the system (*figure 2E; and figure 1B, elements 12, 18, 20, and 14; and column 8, lines 37 - 44; and column 3, lines 37 - 58, especially lines 50 - 58; and column 14, lines 34 - 50*).

22.8. Hansen does not specifically teach expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a *plurality of properties* specific to the system.

22.9. Hansen does not specifically teach referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

22.10. Goodman teaches replacing a shadow property or a property specified in a macro function with a *plurality of properties* (*page 912*).

22.11. Chiles teaches referring to information about a product version used in the system, and selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (***column 2, lines 41 – 56***).

22.12. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (***column 3, lines 20 – 21***).

22.13. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles and Goodman with the art of Hansen to produce the claimed inventions.

23. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen, in view of Goodman, in view of Eidahl, further in view of Chiles.

23.1. Hansen teaches computer readable media (**column 18, lines 38 - 40**), computer implemented methods (**Abstract**), functions (**Abstract; and column 18, lines 38 - 40**) and means (**Abstract**).

23.1.1. Regarding (**Abstract**) and (**Abstract; and column 18, lines 38 - 40**); it would have been obvious that computer implemented methods and program code are functions and means.

23.2. Hansen teaches most of the limitations of the claim as described in claim 22 above.

23.3. Hansen teaches a function for, in response to a input of properties of a component, recording the input values as property data of the component (***column 3, lines 37 – 57; and figure 5; and column 14, lines 34 – 50***).

23.4. Hansen does not specifically teach a means for expanding recursively according to a macro control statement included in the configuration file template, and replacing the shadow property or the property specified in the macro function with a ***plurality of properties*** specific to the system.

23.5. Hansen does not specifically teach a function for referring to information about a product version used in the system.

23.6. Hansen does not specifically teach a function for selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version.

23.7. Chiles teaches a function for referring to information about a product version used in the system (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

23.8. Chiles teaches a function for selecting a configuration file template that matches the product version (*column 2, lines 41 - 56*).

23.9. Goodman teaches replacing a shadow property or a property specified in a macro function with a ***plurality of properties*** (*page 912*).

23.10. The motivation to use the art of Chiles with the art of Hansen is the benefit recited in Chiles of correctly updating software (*column 3, lines 20 - 21*).

23.11. Therefore, as discussed above, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time of invention to use the art of Chiles, Eidahl and Goodman with the art of Hansen to produce the invention of claim 23.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: **Hansen (U.S. Patent 5,838,907), especially Appendix A.**

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russ Guill whose telephone number is 571-272-7955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

26. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group Receptionist: 571-272-2100.

27. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Russ Guill
Examiner
Art Unit 2123

RG

Paul L. Rodriguez 7/7/05
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2125